



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/826,947	04/16/2004	Stephen K. Pinto	17146-0008001	1609
26161 7590 07/10/2009 FISH & RICHARDSON PC P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022				
EXAMINER				
GAMIL TEJAL				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2121				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/10/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/826,947

Applicant(s)

PINTO ET AL.

Examiner

TEJAL J. GAMI

Art Unit

2121

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 March 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/19/2009, 4/1/2009, 7/2/2009.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is responsive to an **AMENDMENT** entered March 19, 2009 for the patent application 10/826947.

Status of Claims

2. Claims 1-28 were rejected in the last Office Action dated September 19, 2008.
As a response to the September 19, 2008 office action, Applicant has Amended claims 1-3, 6-8, 12, 13, 15-18, 21-25, and 28.
Claims 1-28 are now presented for examination in this office action.

Double Patenting

3. Examiner thanks applicant for amending the claims in response to the double patenting rejection presented in the previous office action. The double patenting rejection is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lazarus et al. (U.S. Patent Number: 6,430,539)

As to independent claim 1, Lazarus discloses a machine-base method comprising:

in connection with a project (e.g., predictive modeling of consumer financial behavior) (see Abstract), selecting a first subset of historical data (e.g., merchant vector) (see Figure 5, Col. 16, Lines 4-7, and Col. 37, Lines 54-65) for use in generating a predictive model (e.g. creates a predictive model) based on the historical data about a system being modeled (e.g., based on historical data) (see Col. 4, Lines 11-16);

selecting a model development process from multiple model development processes (e.g., highest correlation with the segment vector, highest average transaction amount, or other selective criteria) (see Table 13; and Col. 37, Lines 54-65);

applying the selected model development process on the first subset of historical data (e.g., merchant vector) (see Figure 5, Col. 16, Lines 4-7, and Col. 37, Lines 54-65) to generate a tentative predictive model (e.g., segment models) (see Table 13 and Col. 38, Lines 23-38);

validating the selected model development process (e.g., lift chart useful for validating the performance of the predictive models) (see Col. 34, Lines 20-23) based on a second subset of the historical data (e.g., merchant segments) (see Figure 5 and Col. 16, Lines 4-7), the second subset (e.g., merchant segments) being at least a portion of a complementary dataset of the first subset (e.g., merchant vectors) or being randomly selected from the historical data and independent of the first subset (see Figure 5 and Col. 16, Lines 4-7); and

applying the validated model development process to a full set of historical data that includes the first and second subsets (e.g., based on historical data) generate a final predictive model (e.g. creates a predictive model) (see Col. 4, Lines 11-16 and Figure 5).

As to independent claim 6, Lazarus discloses a machine-based method comprising:

in connection with a project (e.g., predictive modeling of consumer financial behavior) (see Abstract), selecting a model development process from multiple model development processes to apply on a subset of historical data to generate a first predictive model (e.g., highest correlation with the segment vector, highest average transaction amount, or other selective criteria) (see Table 13; and Col. 37, Lines 54-65), the selected model development process including automatic transformations of variables of the subset of the historical data (e.g., variables) (see Col. 11, Lines 13-23), automatic generation of the first predictive model (e.g., segment models) (see Table 13 and Col. 38, Lines 23-38), and automatic generation of performance measures of the first predictive model (e.g., confirm model performance) (see Col. 4, Lines 25-26), validating the selected development process based on the performance measures of the first predictive model (e.g., validation and analysis of the segment predictive models done to confirm model performance) (see Col. 11, Lines 21-23); and

applying the validated model development process (e.g., lift chart useful for validating the performance of the predictive models) (see Col. 34, Lines 20-23; and Col. 38, Lines 23-38) to a full set of historical data (e.g., based on historical data) (see Col.

4, Lines 11-16) that includes the subset (see Figure 5 and Col. 16, Lines 4-7) to generate a second, final model (e.g. creates a predictive model) (see Col. 4, Lines 11-16).

As to dependent claim 2, Lazarus teaches teaches the method of claim 1 also including displaying on a user interface project goals to enable the user to assess performance of the project (see Figures 7a and 7b), wherein the project goals comprise at least one of:

cumulative lift over an interval of interest, degree of monotonicity, or concordance scores (e.g., cumulative lift time interval) (see Col. 11, Lines 16-25; and Col. 34, Lines 20-64).

As to dependent claim 3, Lazarus teaches the method of claim 2 also including identifying that the tentative predictive model does not produce at least a predefined degree of lift for at least one of the subsets (e.g., lift rank) (see Col. 35, Lines 14-23).

As to dependent claim 4, Lazarus teaches the method of claim 3 also including enabling a user to choose interactively at least one model development criterion (e.g., selective criteria) change or transformation or interaction of variables to improve a fit of the predictive model (e.g., highest correlation) (see Col. 5, Lines 46-49; and Col. 37, Lines 49-65).

As to dependent claim 5, Lazarus teaches the method of claim 4 also including graphically displaying and comparing measures of performance for the validation dataset and the training dataset (e.g., validation to confirm model performance) (see Col. 4, Lines 20-26).

As to dependent claim 7, Lazarus teaches the method of claim 6 also including generating measures of the performance of the predictive model for the at least two datasets (e.g., clusters/segments), the performance measures being generated separately percentile by percentile (e.g., percentile ranking) (see Col. 35, Lines 49-55).

As to dependent claim 8, Lazarus teaches the method of claim 6 also including graphically displaying and comparing measures of the performance for at least two datasets (e.g., ranking) (see Col. 34, Lines 21-23; and Col. 35, Lines 49-55).

As to dependent claim 9, Lazarus teaches the method of claim 6 also including persistently storing the validated model development process and a validated model for computing propensities for at least one target outcome variable, the propensities serving as indices of a score for non-historical data (see Col. 35, Lines 49-55).

As to dependent claim 10, Lazarus teaches the method of claim 6 also including providing a user interface (e.g., lift chart; models) (see Col. 34, Lines 20-64; and Col. 35, Lines 32-38) for assessing project goals against performance (e.g., goal) (see Col. 1, Lines 35-37).

As to dependent claim 11, Lazarus teaches the method of claim 6 also including providing a user interface for selecting at least one subset of the historical data in addition to a training subset (see Col. 4, Lines 20-25).

As to dependent claim 12, Lazarus teaches the method of claim 6 providing a user interface for displaying the performance of the first predictive model for at least two subsets of the historical data for an interval of interest (e.g., time interval) (see Col. 4, Lines 16-26).

As to dependent claim 13, Lazarus teaches the method of claim 6 enabling a user to choose interactively (e.g., selective criteria) at least one transformation or interaction of variables to improve the model development process (e.g., highest correlation) (see Col. 5, Lines 46-49; and Col. 37, Lines 49-65).

As to dependent claim 14, Lazarus teaches the method of claim 6 also including cross-validating the final model using random portions of the historical data (e.g., cross-segment) (see Col. 11, Lines 8-23).

As to dependent claim 15, Lazarus teaches the method of claim 6 providing a user interface that enables the user to select at least one validation dataset and invoke a process for validating the model development process (e.g., selective criteria) (see Col. 37, Lines 49-65).

As to dependent claim 16, Lazarus teaches the method of claim 6 providing a user interface that enables the user to point and click to cause display of information about the validation of the model development process (e.g., computer) (see Col. 6, Lines 41-67).

As to dependent claim 17, Lazarus teaches the method of claim 16 in which the information about the validation of the model development process includes at least one of:

a statistical report card (e.g. statistical information) (see Col. 3, Lines 50-54) with a link to the statistical report chart (e.g., statistical model) (see Col. 4, Lines 25-28), a cumulative lift chart with a link to the cumulative lift chart, and a non-cumulative lift chart

with a link to the non-cumulative lift chart (e.g., cumulative lift chart) (see Col. 34, Lines 20-50).

As to dependent claim 18, Lazarus teaches the method of claim 17 in which invocation of the link to the statistical report card (e.g. statistical information) (see Col. 3, Lines 50-54) causes display of the statistics of the validation of the model development process (e.g., validation of statistical model) (see Col. 4, Lines 25-28).

As to dependent claim 19, Lazarus teaches the method of claim 17 in which invocation of the link to the cumulative lift chart causes display of a cumulative lift chart (e.g., cumulative lift chart) (see Col. 34, Lines 20-50).

As to dependent claim 20, Lazarus teaches the method of claim 17 in which invocation of the link to the cumulative lift chart causes display of a non-cumulative lift chart (e.g., segment lift chart) (see Col. 34, Lines 20-50).

As to dependent claim 21, Lazarus teaches the method of claim 17 in which a user is enabled to choose interactively at least one performance criterion (e.g., selective criteria) change or transformation or interaction of variables to improve the model development process (e.g., highest correlation) (see Col. 5, Lines 46-49; and Col. 37, Lines 49-65).

As to dependent claim 22, Lazarus teaches the method of claim 6 also including providing a user interface that enables the user to select at least one machine automated model development process applied to the entire set of the historical data for the validated model development process (e.g., selective criteria) (see Col. 37, Lines 49-65).

As to dependent claim 23, Lazarus teaches the method of claim 6 also including providing a user interface that enables the user to point and click to cause display of information about the performance of the validated model development process applied to the entire set of historical data (e.g., computer) (see Col. 6, Lines 41-67).

As to dependent claim 24, Lazarus teaches the method of claim 23 in which the information about the performance of the first model for two independent datasets includes at least one of the following:

a statistical report card (e.g. statistical information) (see Col. 3, Lines 50-54) with a link to the statistical report chart (e.g., statistical model) (see Col. 4, Lines 25-28), a cumulative lift chart with a link to the cumulative lift chart, a non-cumulative lift chart with a link to the non-cumulative lift chart (e.g., cumulative lift chart) (see Col. 34, Lines 20-50).

As to dependent claim 25, Lazarus teaches the method of claim 24 in which the invocation of the link to the statistical report card (e.g. statistical information) (see Col. 3, Lines 50-54) causes display of the statistics of the validation of the model development process (e.g., validation of statistical model) (see Col. 4, Lines 25-28).

As to dependent claim 26, Lazarus teaches the method of claim 24 in which the invocation of the link to the cumulative lift chart causes display of a cumulative lift chart (e.g., cumulative lift chart) (see Col. 34, Lines 20-50).

As to dependent claim 27, Lazarus teaches the method of claim 24 in which the invocation of the link to the cumulative lift chart causes display of a non-cumulative lift chart (e.g., segment lift chart) (see Col. 34, Lines 20-50).

As to dependent claim 28, Lazarus teaches the method of claim 6 also including storing the final model and validation results of the model development process persistently (e.g., stored in databases) (see Col. 6, Lines 41-67).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's amendment and arguments filed March 19, 2009 have been fully considered. The amendment does not overcome the original art rejection and the arguments are not persuasive. The following are the Examiner's observations in regard thereto.

Applicant Argues:

The examiner contended that Lazarus validated a model development process at "prior art Col. 4, Lines 25-26 where Lazarus discloses validation used to confirm model performance". However, confirming model performance does not mean validating the process of developing a model. The model development process is not the generated model itself, but a process that generates the model. The model development process can include automatic transformations of variables of the data (e.g., specification, pages 11-16), automatic selection of transformed variables (e.g., id.), automatic generation of a predictive model (e.g., specification, pages 22-23). Lazarus did not describe and would not have made obvious any consideration of whether the process of generating the predictive model was valid or not.

Examiner Responds:

Examiner is not persuaded. Using applicant's definition of the model development process to be "automatic generation of a predictive model (e.g., applicant's specification pages 22-23)," see Lazarus Figure 5 and Col. 16 Lines 4-7 for prior art anticipation of the predictive model generation system. And according to independent claim 6 where

"validating the selected development process" is "based on the performance measures of the predictive model," see Col. 34, Lines 20-23 for a lift chart useful for validating the performance of the predictive models. Under such considerations, the prior art anticipates the claims as written.

Applicant Argues:

In addition, Lazarus did not describe and would not have made obvious "selecting a model development process from multiple model development processes". Lazarus used one model generation module for generating his model (column 31, lines 30-35). Lazarus did not consider different development processes or select one of the multiple processes to generate his model.

Examiner Responds:

Examiner is not persuaded. See office action above for prior art anticipation of this newly presented claim limitation. See particularly Table 13 and Col. 37, Lines 54-65 for examples of model development processes, such as, "highest correlation with the segment vector, highest average transaction amount, or other selective criteria." Under such considerations, the prior art anticipates selecting a model development process from multiple model development processes.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Tang et al. (U.S. Publication Number: 2004/0002833) teaches systems and methods for mining model accuracy display for multiple state prediction.

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tejal J. Gami whose telephone number is (571) 270-1035. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert DeCady can be reached on (571) 272-3819. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Albert DeCady
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Tech Center 2100

/TJG/

/Ramesh B. Patel/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2121